DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 573 CG 012 694

AUTHOR Higgins, Patricia E.; Day, Marla W.
TITLE Television's Action Arsenal: Weapon Use in Prime Time.
INSTITUTION United States Conference of Mayors, Washington, D. C.
SPONS AGENCY George Gund Foundation, Cleveland, Ohio.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 68p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Anti Social Behavior; Broadcast Industry; *Crime; Death; Police; *Programing (Broadcast); Realism; Research Projects; *Television; *Violence
IDENTIFIERS *Weapons Use

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to fill a basic information gap in the television violence research literature, namely, or lack of information on the instruments of violence. Weapon use was chosen not only because it is a manageable component of the entire television violence issue, but because it is one that is clearly subject to modification by the broadcast industry. Weapons are not behavior, attitudes or values that can be altered by a camera stance; they are instruments which are supplied to or withheld from the actors to develop a story line. Because they are essentially action props, weapons can be added to or subtracted from a scene. In short, someone controls the flow. This report suggests that weapon use on television is excessive and uncomfortably antiseptic. Little bloodletting or suffering accompany the weapon use. Thus, the severity of the results of the weapon use is ignored. This report must be regarded as a first step. While it has made a significant contribution to the understanding of the nature of television violence, it has more often pointed out the need for additional research. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED155573

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Andrew Frazier, Jr
Handgun Control Staff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CG012594

2

Television's Action Arsenal: Weapon Use in Prime Time

by

PATRICIA BEAULIEU HIGGINS

MARLA WILSON RAY

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

3

Copyright © 1978 United States Conference of Mayors

John J. Gunther
Executive Director

The Honorable Lee Alexander
Mayor of Syracuse
President

Michael A. diNunzio
General Counsel

HANDGUN CONTROL STAFF

Nancy Loving, Director

Michael Clancy
Patty Beaulieu Higgins
Andrew Frazier, Jr.
Marla Wilson Ray

The Handgun Control Staff of the United States Conference of Mayors is funded by a grant from the George Gund Foundation of Cleveland, Ohio. The opinions and viewpoints expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the policies of the George Gund Foundation.

FOREWORD

Television may very well be the most significant factor that separates, in a very real sense, the first half of the 20th Century from the second half. Since its introduction into American homes in 1941, television has expanded our experience and familiarized us with distant lands and peoples. It has allowed millions of viewers to witness history as it is made and to 'travel' as far as the moon. This instrument knows no boundaries; nothing seems to escapes its camera's eye. We are indeed a global village.

People who were born after 1950 and reared in the television age have difficulty comprehending the dramatic changes television has introduced into American culture. They also cannot fully understand the controversy over television violence and its impact on viewers, particularly on young viewers. Such a controversy implies a standard of values or behavior against which the television-influenced behavior is judged. Thus, to suggest that television makes its youthful viewers "more aggressive" than: *whom*?—than non-television viewing children or children who have never been exposed to a television culture? It may also be difficult to decide if television violence reflects or exaggerates real life violence if one's real life has incorporated television violence since birth.

These and other vagaries surround the current debate about the impact and effects of television violence. While there is an abundance of research data on its effects, there is relatively little information about its nature. Basic questions remain unanswered, such as: What does television violence look like? In which situations is it most commonly portrayed? What character types are most probable protagonists? And by what means is it employed?

This study was conducted to fill a basic information gap in the television violence research literature, namely a lack of information on the instruments of violence. Weapon use was chosen not only because it is a manageable component of the entire

television violence issue, but because it is one that is clearly subject to modification by the broadcast industry. Weapons are not behavior, attitudes or values that can be altered by a camera stance; they are instruments which are supplied to or with-held from the actors to develop a story line. Because they are essentially action props, weapons can be added to or subtracted from a scene. In short, someone controls the flow.

This report suggests that weapon use on television is excessive and uncomfortably antiseptic. Little blood 'letting' or suffering accompany the weapon use. Thus, the severity of the results of the weapon use is ignored.

In the end, this report must be regarded as a first step. While it has made a significant contribution to our understanding of the nature of television violence, it has more often pointed the way to additional research that is needed. We hope this report assists and encourages those new efforts.

John J. Gunther
Executive Director
U.S. Conference of Mayors

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

FOREWORD iii

LIST OF TABLES & FIGURES vii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ix

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY xi

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY 7

CHAPTER 3: ANALYSIS 11

A. All Weapon Appearances 11

B. Confrontations 12

Weapons Analysis 21
User Analysis 23
Target Analysis 24
Results Analysis 25

C. Nonconfrontations 28

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSIONS 35

APPENDICES 43

A. Form for Recording Data on Weapon Appearance ... 44
B. Weapon Uses Recorded But Excluded from Analysis 45
C. Criminal Types Seen on Television 46
D. Methodology Supplement 47
E. Weapon Appearances, Injuries and Deaths, by Program Episode 56

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1. Television Programs Included in Sample 8

Figure 2. Nature of Weapon Appearances 12

Table 1. Program Distribution of Weapon Appearances xiii

Table 2. Frequency Distributions for All Weapon Appearances 13–16

Table 3. Weapon Appearances Involving a Confrontation 17–20

Table 4. Results of Weapon Uses Against Single Targets 26

Table 5. Results of Weapon Uses Against Multiple Targets 27

Table 6. Reasons for Weapon Uses Resulting in Death 28

Table 7. Weapon Appearances Not Involving Confrontations 29–31

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to those who helped develop this report. We wish to thank the *National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting (NCCB)* for making available its television videotapes and monitoring equipment, and particularly Pat Scott of the NCCB staff for her advice and cooperation.

We are especially indebted to Garry Bozylinsky, computer expert par excellence and manager of the U.S. Conference of Mayors Library and Information Service, for his limitless patience during the many hours spent guiding us through the multiple stages of computer analysis.

We also wish to thank Joyce Latham of Editorial Experts, Alexandria, Virginia, who edited and organized the report, and Andrew Frazier, Jr., who spent many long hours typing and correcting this manuscript.

P.B.H.
M.W.R.
December 1977

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In this study of televised weapon use, 73 hours of prime-time "action" shows were observed between March and August 1977. Most "action" shows aired during that time period were police and detective dramas. The authors' intention is to describe the nature and extent of weapons on television and to determine the results of the weapon use. It is hoped that those continuing to research television violence will be able to determine the effects of weapon use on viewers.

This study is limited to the use of weapons that can be held in the user's hand—i.e., handguns, long guns, knives, sticks, clubs, pipes, and other objects used to stab, hit, or choke. Each time such a weapon appeared the following were noted: the type of weapon; the manner of weapon appearance (whether the weapon was only shown, used to threaten, or actually used); the reason for the weapon appearance (robbery, to make or resist an arrest, premeditated murder, etc.); the character types of the weapon user and target; and the result of the weapon's appearance or use (injury to or resistance by target, misses, etc.). This information was then coded and cross tabulated by computer.

Major findings are as follows:

- In 73 hours of prime-time television viewing, weapons appeared 648 times, an average of almost nine (8.87) per hour. Among those appearances, 68 percent (N=432) involved actual confrontations between the user of the weapon and another individual.
- Handguns were by far the most commonly seen weapon. They were involved in 72 percent (N=468) of the total 648 weapon appearances and in 79 percent (N=340) of the confrontations.
- Whites and males were the overwhelming majority of both users and targets of weapons. In the 432 confrontations observed, whites were 84 percent (N=364) of the users and

81 percent (N=351) of the targets. Males were 90 percent (N=390) of the users and 86 percent (N=373) of the targets.

- Weapon users in confrontations were about evenly divided between police officers and bad guys/criminals. (The "police officer" category included private detectives, security guards, and others who, by their profession, are authorized to carry weapons.) Police officers were 45.5 percent of all users in confrontations and their most frequent targets were bad guys/criminals (173 of 196, or 88 percent). Bad guy/criminal users, almost half of all weapon users in confrontations, aimed their weapons at police officers in more than half of their confrontations, while in 13 percent of these incidents their targets were other bad guys/criminals and in 19 percent of their confrontations they had "miscellaneous (nonpolice) good guys" as targets.

- Police users were more likely to threaten with their weapons than to actually use them, such as firing a gun or stabbing with a knife. In 71 percent of the 196 confrontations in which police used weapons, they threatened with their weapons, while they used those weapons only about 25 percent of the time. In contrast, bad guys/criminals used their weapons slightly *more* often than they threatened with them (47 percent uses compared to 45 percent threats).

- Only 36 on-screen deaths were inflicted by the 648 weapons that were observed, an average of about 1 death for every 2 hours of viewing. Nineteen of the people who died were bad guys/criminals; 10 of those 19 deaths were inflicted by other bad guys and 9 by police officers. Four of those who died were police officers, all killed by bad guys/criminals. The remaining 13 deaths involved non-police good guys or innocent bystanders, who were also killed by bad guys/criminals. (An additional 12 deaths were inflicted by weapons excluded from this study, such as automobiles or poison.)

- An extraordinary number of shots fired on television were misses. Of 265 shots fired by handguns, 84 percent were misses; only 8 percent resulted in injury, and 7.5 percent in death. Of 81 shots fired by long guns, 81 percent were misses, 6 percent resulted in injury, and 11 percent in death.

- While many critics of the television industry have conjured

up an image of countless televised murders, replete with blood and gore, this is an exaggerated image. In fact, the negligible incidence of blood or other signs of suffering, together with the very large proportion of "misses" when shots were fired, combine to attach an unrealistic and potentially dangerous lack of severity to the consequences of weapon use.

- "Hawaii Five-O" 's four episodes had the greatest number (81) of weapon appearances, which came to an average of 20.3 per episode. During one episode, 43 weapon appearances were recorded. In contrast, the four "Quincy" episodes had 10 weapon appearances and those of "Switch" had only 8. In one episode of "Quincy," no weapons appeared.
- Other programs with frequent weapon appearances were "Starsky & Hutch" with 60 or an average of 15 per episode,

TABLE 1

Weapon Appearances, Injuries and Deaths, By Program (Includes Four Episodes)

Program	Weapon Appearances		Injuries Resulting	Deaths Resulting
	Total	Episode Average		
Hawaii Five-O	81	20.3	3	7
Starsky and Hutch	60	15.0	1	4
Police Story	55	13.8	3	3
Baretta	50	12.5	4	1
Sun. Night Mystery Movie	49	12.3	1	1
Police Woman	48	12.0	5	2
Delvecchio (3 episodes)	36	12.0	2	0
Rockford Files	38	9.5	4	1
Kojak	36	9.0	3	5
Barnaby Jones	35	8.8	3	6
Charlie's Angels	29	7.3	2	1
$6 Million Man	26	6.5	3	0
Kingston: Confidential	18	4.5	3	0
Feather & Father Gang	15	3.8	0	2
Quincy	10	2.5	0	1
Switch	8	2.0	2	0
Bionic Woman (1 episode)	6		0	0
Most Wanted (1 episode)	7		1	0
Dog and Cat (1 episode)	16		0	0
Hunter (1 episode)	13		0	1
Andros Targets (1 episode)	0		0	0
Stonestreet (1 episode)	12		1	1
TOTAL	648		41	36

"Police Story," with 55, or an average of 13.8 per episode; "Baretta," with 50 weapon appearances, or an average of 12.5 per episode; and "Police Woman," with 48 weapon appearances, or an average of 12 per episode. (See table 1 and appendix E for program information.)

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Violence on television has been highly publicized and widely debated in recent years. The claims against televised violence are that it is excessive, that if offends our finer sensibilities, that it is often unnecessary and unrealistic, and that children may be adversely affected by the violence they observe. It has been estimated, for example, that the average American child will view 15,000 hours of television by the time he/she graduates from high school and during this period will witness 18,000 televised murders and countless other violent acts.[1]

During the fall of 1977, a fifteen-year-old "TV addict" on trial in Miami, Florida, for first-degree murder claimed as his defense that he was driven temporarily insane by intense exposure to violence on television. The youth's plea did not persuade the jury; he was convicted and sentenced to life in prison. His lawyers now plan to sue the networks for programming which incited the youth to commit violent acts. This was an extreme case, to be sure, but one that has been in the making for years.

Pressure is now being exerted upon program sponsors to drop the most violent shows; as a result, networks say they are "housecleaning" their programs, and that producers are remodeling their scripts. Aaron Spelling, executive producer of "Starsky and Hutch" (one of the most violent TV shows, as rated by the National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting), has promised: "We're never going to kill anybody unless it's totally essential."[2]

Much of the public's outcry is based on studies that attempt to show the extent to which media violence causes or encourages violent behavior in youth—or whether, in fact, such a causal relationship exists. These 2,600 studies, dating back to 1950, have been conducted by Congressional Committees, the Surgeon General, public interest groups, psychologists and behavioral scientists, and the television networks themselves. For the

most part, the studies have focused only on youth, using a variety of definitions of "violent acts," both "real" and televised.[3] Their findings have been varied and contradictory:

—Heavy viewers of violent television have a distorted view of reality, including an increased fear of victimization;[4]

—Heavy viewers are desensitized to violence;[5]

—Viewing television violence may lead to lessened aggression in *females*;[6]

—Today's television dramas are not "real" enough to cause any direct behavioral response;[7]

—Under certain conditions, and depending on the types of violence portrayed, exposure to televised violence is capable of producing increased inclination toward agression in children.[8]

Because all parties agree at least that television *is* "violent," although they disagree about its importance and effects, the nature of this "violence" deserved a closer look. As in all issues that produce extremes of opinion, the component parts of the subject merit documentation, chiefly to prevent distortion of the facts to suit already formed conclusions.

This study focuses exclusively on weapon use as an important and easily measured aspect of television violence. Its purpose is to explore the use of weapons on television and not to assess the degree to which the presence or use of weapons is in fact "violent."[9] This study only describes weapon use on television by answering such questions as: "Which weapon is most commonly seen on television?"; "Do weapons used by 'good guys' differ from those used by 'bad guys'?"; "Which are the most common weapons used in robbery, rape, and murder?"; "Which weapon is portrayed with most lethal results?" and, "How realistic is weapon use on television?"

Again, this study does not attempt to assess the impact of televised weapons use—realistic or not—on viewers. Instead, it provide documentation that may be helpful to other re-

searchers, particularly when the definition of "violent act" comes into question.

Future research should examine the impact of not only televised violence (including weapon use) on viewers, but also the more subtle images produced by televised weapon use. To the extent that viewers "believe" what they see on television is realistic, the images of heroes and anti-heroes, and of the powerful and the dominant, as shown by their ability to use weapons against their enemies successfully, are worthy of critical examination.

The problems involved in measuring televised violence and defining acceptable levels are complex. However, the accusations that "media violence begets violence" raise important questions that merit the effort required to answer them.

10

FOOTNOTES

1. Michael Rothenberg, "Effect of TV Violence on Children and Youth," *Journal of The American Medical Association*, vol. 234, December 8, 1975.

2. *The Washington Post*, "TV's Violent Departure," February 23, 1977, p. B1.

3. See the following: George Gerbner and Larry Gross, "Living with Television: The Violence Profile," *Journal of Communication*, Spring, 1976; Victor B. Cline, *The Desensitization of Children to Television Violence* (Bethesda, Md.: National Institute of Health, 1972); and Cline, "The Child Before the TV: The Impact of Television Viewing on Children's Behavior and Values," *The Police Chief*, vol. XLII, no. 6, June 1976; Leonard D. Eron, *et al.*, "Does Television Violence Cause Aggression?" *American Psychologist*, vol. 27, April 1972; Lieberman Research, Inc., *Overview: Five Year Review of Research Sponsored by the American Broadcasting Company, September 1970 through August 1975* (New York, 1976); Seymour Feshback and R.D. Singer, *Television and Aggression* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971); and Douglass Cater and Stephen Strickland, *TV Violence and The Child: The Evolution and Fate of The Surgeon General's Report* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1975).

4. Gerbner and Gross, "Living with Television."

5. Cline, "The Child Before the TV."

6. Eron, "Does Television Violence Cause Aggression?" The catharsis theory contends that seeing violence on television is good for children because it allows them to vicariously release their own hostilities. According to Dr. Eron, television may provide for females an outlet for aggression not otherwise socially acceptable, thus leading to lessened aggression for that group.

7. Feshback and Singer, *Television and Aggression*.

8. Lieberman Research reached this conclusion in its ABC-commissioned study of 10,000 children. The report explains that "it was not possible to determine a causal relationship between 'inclination toward aggression' and actual aggression."

9. As pointed out in Leonard Berkowitz, Ann Frodi, Charles Turner and Lynn S. Simons, *"The Simulating and Inhibiting Effects of Weapons on Aggressive Behavior,"* (University of Wisconsin: Mimeo-

graph, 1976): "It is possible that media portrayals of violent episodes create learned associations between aggressive acts and firearms." Dr. Berkowitz also cites an unpublished study of thirty hours of prime-time crime drama television shows which found that approximately 80 percent of all displays of a drawn weapon were immediately followed by an "aggressive out-burst." However, in our study 68.5 percent of all weapon appearances involved a confrontation between user and target; the remaining 31.5 percent were nonconfrontational in nature.

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY

The sample for this study consisted of 73 hours of "action" shows broadcast during prime-time (8:00-11:00 p.m.) on the three major television networks. Of all such shows aired during the months of our study, most were police or detective dramas. Fourteen programs videotaped in March 1977 were made available by the National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting (NCCB). These videotaped shows were viewed first, allowing a check of recorded data for accuracy by using rewind and stop action. Live television broadcasts were monitored during June, July, and August 1977. Four episodes of each program were viewed in the six-month period.[1] Together, these shows represent approximately one month of seven-day-a-week prime-time television viewing. Figure 1 lists the programs included in the study, their networks, and the dates they were broadcast.

Six shows for which data were recorded fall into the "miscellaneous" category. Each show in this category was either discontinued by the networks in the early stages of the research or represented a pilot program only. No movies were included, except the regular "Sunday Night Mystery Movie" which featured alternating episodes of "McCloud," "McMillan," and "Lannigan's Rabbi."

Scope of Analysis

Only weapons which can be held in the hand of the user—handguns, long guns, knives, sticks, clubs, pipes, and other objects which can be used to stab, hit, or choke—were included in this study.[2] Automobiles, explosives, and poisons were excluded, as were hands, fists, and feet.

Before beginning the actual data recording, five videotaped shows were viewed to determine the boundaries for describing hand-held weapon use. Information in the following categories was recorded for each weapon appearance. (See appendix D for detailed descriptions of these categories.):

- Type of weapon;
- How the weapon appeared (shown only, threatened with, actually "used");
- Reason for the appearance (to make arrest, robbery, to resist arrest);
- Description of user (race, sex, estimated age, type of character);
- Description of target (race, sex, estimated age, type of character);
- Result of weapon appearance (resistance or compliance by target, injury or death).

Along with this basic descriptive information, additional notes were made on the type of criminal activity, if any, involved in a given incident and specific listings of weapons

FIGURE 1

Television Shows Included in Sample

Show Name	Network	Weekday Aired	Dates Aired (1977) Episode 1	Episode 2	Episode 3	Episode 4
1. Six Million Dollar Man	ABC	Sunday	June 26	July 3	July 17	July 24
2. Baretta	ABC	Wednesday	March 9	June 14	June 29	July 6
3. Charlie's Angels	ABC	Wednesday	March 9	June 29	July 6	July 13
4. Starsky and Hutch	ABC	Saturday	March 12	July 2	July 30	August 6
5. Feather and Father Gang	ABC	Saturday	March 7	July 2	July 23	July 30
6. Sunday Night Mystery Movie	NBC	Sunday	March 6 (McCloud)	July 3 (Lannigan's Rabbi)	July 10 (McMillan)	August 7 (McMillan)
7. Police Woman	NBC	Tuesday	March 1	June 7	July 5	July 26
8. Best of Police Story	NBC	Tuesday	March 1	June 28	July 5	July 26
9. Kingston: Confidential	NBC	Wednesday	July 6	July 13	July 20	August 3
10. Rockford Files	NBC	Friday	July 15	July 22	July 29	August 5
11. Quincy	NBC	Friday	July 1	July 8	July 15	July 29
12. Switch	CBS	Sunday	June 26	July 3	July 17	July 31
13. Kojak	CBS	Tuesday	June 7	July 5	July 12	July 19
14. Hawaii Five-O	CBS	Thursday	March 17	June 30	July 7	July 14
15. Barnaby Jones	CBS	Thursday	March 17	June 30	July 7	July 21
16. Delvecchio	CBS	Sunday	July 3	July 10	July 17	Not Available
17. Miscellaneous:						
Bionic Woman	ABC	Wednesday	March 9			
Dog and Cat	ABC	Saturday	March 12			
Most Wanted	ABC	Monday	March 7			
Stonestreet	NBC	Sunday	July 10			
Andros Targets	CBS	Monday	March 14			
Hunter	CBS	Friday	March 18			

which fell into an "other" category, as previously described. (The form used to record data is attached as appendix A.) A list of weapons not held in the hand was maintained even though they were otherwise excluded from the analysis. (See appendix B.)

After gathering raw data for the seventy-three hours of television viewing, the information in each category was numerically coded and tabulated by computer.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Delvecchio" is an exception. It was cancelled in the summer season; thus, only three episodes were viewed.

2. Weapons which fell into the "other" category include: ashtray, bottles, fireplace poker, flashlight, rolling pin, spearguns, rocks, wrenches, pillow, toy fire engine, diamond choker, can of spray paint, brass knuckles, letter opener and golf club.

CHAPTER 3: ANALYSIS

Weapons appeared in two kinds of incidents. One was a "confrontation," in which the weapon was used against a target and the other was a "non-confrontation," with no target involved. Confrontations were of primary interest because these incidents lend themselves to analysis of both user and target behavior and of the results of weapon use. Therefore, although this chapter presents findings of all weapon appearances (confrontations and non-confrontations), most of the emphasis is on confrontations.

Figure 2 shows the circumstances of the 648 weapon appearances observed, while tables 2, 3 and 7 present frequency distributions for all variables in each type of appearance. Note in this discussion that the word "used" most often refers to a specific manner of appearance (involving, for example, the actual firing of a gun), as described in the methodology section and in appendix D. When appearing without quotes, the word implies the utilization of a weapon in a more general sense.

A. All Weapon Appearances

As table 2 shows, when all 648 weapon appearances are considered, handguns were the predominant *weapon* seen (468 of 648, or 72 percent). A threat was the most common *manner* of appearance (38 percent), and making an arrest was the most frequent *reason* for the weapon appearance (44 percent). *Whites*, *males*, and *police officers* were predominant among users. Only 59 of the 648 weapon appearances involved nonwhite weapon users.

When all weapon appearances are considered together, target and result information becomes quite confusing to the reader. In the "result" category, for example, the incidence of "not applicable" information is very high because of the number of

FIGURE 2

Nature Of Weapon Appearances

	N	%	Targets	N
Confrontation	432	(67%)	Single targets; Multiple targets:	304 128
Non-confrontation	201	(31%)	No targets involved:	0
Weapon used on nonhuman target*	15	(2%)	Human targets involved: No human target involved:	7 8
Total weapon appearances	648	(100%)		

* This type of incident is neither purely confrontational nor purely non-confrontational in nature, since sometimes a human target is indirectly involved and sometimes not. Because of the small number of cases, they are excluded from further analysis.

non-confrontation situations. Thus, it is useful to separate confrontations and non-confrontations, as is done in the following sections of this analysis.

B. Confrontations

Table 3 depicts the weapons, users, targets, and results in the 432 weapon appearances involving confrontations. Again, handguns were by far the most frequently seen weapons (340 of 432, or 79 percent). Threats were more common (57 percent) than all other manners of appearance combined. Whites and males as weapon users were overwhelmingly predominant.

Even though an arrest attempt was the most common reason for weapon use in confrontations, the bad guy/criminal category of users was seen slightly more often than police officer users in confrontations. In other words, the most common reason for weapon use is not necessarily correlated with the most common user. Which reasons for weapon use are most often associated with which kinds of weapon users will be discussed in the later section on cross-tabulations. However, by simply examining the frequency distributions in table 3, it is possible to understand why bad guys/criminals are the most frequent users even

TABLE 2

Frequency Distributions For All Weapon Appearances

Weapon Type	#	%	Manner of Appearance	#	%	Reason	#	%
Handgun	(468)	72.2	Threat	(246)	38.0	To make arrest	(286)	44.1
Long gun	(116)	17.9	Used	(164)	25.3	Premeditated murder	(81)	12.5
Other**	(24)	3.7	Potential threat	(125)	19.3	Not applicable	(80)	12.3
Knife	(23)	3.5	Shown only	(64)	9.9	To force	(71)	11.0
Stick, club, pipe	(17)	2.6	Attempted use	(20)	3.1	To resist arrest	(62)	9.6
Total	(648)	99.9*	Use of non-human	(15)	2.3	Self-defense	(25)	3.9
			Shown being loaded or cleaned	(12)	1.9	Robbery	(18)	2.8
			Gun used to hit	(2)	0.3	Premeditated assault	(9)	1.4
			Total	(648)	100.1*	Unpremeditated assault	(8)	1.2
						Random-psychotic	(3)	0.5
						To frighten	(3)	0.5
						Rape	(2)	0.3
						Total	(648)	100.2*

* Total does not equal 100 percent because of rounding.
** Includes hand-held objects such as ashtrays, bottles, and wrenches.

TABLE 2

Frequency Distributions For All Weapon Appearances (Continued)

USER INFORMATION

Race	#	%	Sex	#	%	Character Type	#	%
White	(530)	81.8	Male	(563)	86.9	Police officer	(323)	49.8
Non-white	(59)	9.1	Female	(38)	5.9	Bad guy/criminal	(246)	38.0
Unknown	(30)	4.6	Not applicable	(29)	4.5	Not applicable	(29)	4.5
Not applicable	(29)	4.5	Unknown	(18)	2.8	Non-police "good guy"	(27)	4.2
Total	(648)	100.0	Total	(648)	100.1*	"Bad" police officer	(14)	2.2
						Unknown	(5)	0.8
						Friend or family of target	(4)	0.6
						Total	(648)	100.1*

* Total does not equal 100 percent because of rounding.

TABLE 2

Frequency Distributions For All Weapon Appearances (Continued)

TARGET INFORMATION

Race	#	%
Single white	(257)	39.7
Not applicable	(204)	31.5
Multiple whites	(104)	16.0
Single non-white	(51)	7.9
Mixed races	(27)	4.2
Multiple non-whites	(3)	0.5
Single unknown	(1)	0.2
Multiple unknown	(1)	0.2
Total	(648)	100.2*

Sex	#	%
Single male	(280)	43.2
Not applicable	(204)	31.5
Multiple males	(103)	15.9
Mixed sexes	(30)	4.6
Single female	(27)	4.2
Multiple females	(2)	0.3
Single unknown	(1)	0.2
Multiple unknown	(1)	0.2
Total	(648)	100.1*

Character type	#	%
Not applicable	(204)	31.5
Single bad guy/criminal	(151)	23.3
Single police officer	(97)	15.0
Multiple bad guys/criminals	(67)	10.3
Multiple police officers	(38)	5.9
Single good guy	(34)	5.2
Multiple good guys	(16)	2.5
Single innocent bystander	(16)	2.5
Multiple innocent bystander	(10)	1.5
Single "bad" police officer	(8)	1.2
Single family/friend of user	(2)	0.3
Multiple family/friend of user	(2)	0.3
Mixed good and bad guys	(2)	0.3
Single unknown	(1)	0.2
Total	(648)	100.0

* Total does not equal 100 percent because of rounding.

TABLE 2

Frequency Distributions for all Weapon Appearances (Continued)

Result	#	%
Not applicable	(218)	33.6
Compliance	(153)	23.6
Resistance	(96)	14.8
Miss and resistance	(79)	12.2
Death	(29)	4.5
Injury	(26)	4.0
Compliance and resistance	(15)	2.3
Injury and compliance	(7)	1.1
Miss and no injury	(5)	0.8
Miss, resistance and compliance	(4)	0.6
Miss and compliance	(4)	0.6
Miss, injury and resistance	(4)	0.6
Miss, resistance and death	(4)	0.6
Miss and injury	(2)	0.3
Injury and resistance	(1)	0.2
Miss, compliance and death	(1)	0.2
Total	(648)	100.0

though the most common reason for weapon use is to make an arrest.

Most of the possible reason categories would normally be associated with "bad guy" users, such as premediated murder or to resist an arrest. Within the predetermined framework of categories, "bad guys" have a greater variety of reasons to use weapons than do "police officers" whose reasons cluster in the "making arrests" category. Therefore, reasons associated with "bad guy" users are distributed over a wide range of possibilities, while those of "police officer" users are primarily concentrated in a single category.

In addressing the targets of weapon confrontations, it is clear from table 3 that whites and males represent the vast majority of targets as well as users. Note that all targets were separated to reflect single or multiple targets. This distinction is useful in some of the cross-tabulations discussed later, but for the purpose of describing frequencies, the variables can be combined.

TABLE 3

Weapon Appearances Involving A Confrontation

Weapon Type	#	%	Manner of Appearance	#	%	Reason	#	%
Handgun	(340)	78.7	Threat	(246)	56.9	To make arrest	(186)	43.1
Long gun	(43)	10.0	Use	(164)	38.0	Premeditated murder	(76)	17.6
Other	(22)	5.1	Attempted use	(20)	4.6	To force	(61)	14.1
Stick, club, pipe	(14)	3.2	Gun used to hit	(2)	0.5	To resist arrest	(54)	12.5
Knife	(13)	3.0	Total	(432)	100.0	Self-defense	(18)	4.2
Total	(432)	100.0				Robbery	(16)	3.7
						Premeditated assault	(9)	2.1
						Unpremeditated assault	(8)	1.9
						Rape	(2)	0.5
						To frighten	(2)	0.5
						Total	(432)	100.2*

* Total does not equal 100 percent because of rounding.

TABLE 3

Weapon Appearances Involving A Confrontation (Continued)

TARGET INFORMATION

Race	#	%	Sex	#	%	Character Type	#	%
Single white	(252)	58.3	Single male	(275)	63.7	Single bad guy/criminal	(150)	34.7
Multiple white	(99)	22.9	Multiple males	(98)	22.7	Single cop	(94)	21.8
Single non-white	(51)	11.8	Mixed sexes	(28)	6.5	Multiple bad guy/criminal	(62)	14.4
Mixed races	(25)	5.8	Single female	(27)	6.3	Multiple police officers	(38)	8.8
Multiple non-white	(3)	0.7	Multiple females	(2)	0.5	Single good guy	(33)	7.6
Single unknown	(1)	0.2	Single unknown	(1)	0.2	Multiple good guys	(16)	3.7
Multiple unknown	(1)	0.2	Multiple unknown	(1)	0.2	Single innocent bystander	(16)	3.7
Total	(432)	99.9*	Total	(432)	100.1*	Single bad police officer	(8)	1.9
						Multiple innocent bystanders	(8)	1.9
						Single family-friend of user	(2)	0.5
						Multiple family-friend of user	(2)	0.5
						Mixed good and bad guys	(2)	0.5
						Single unknown	(1)	0.2
						Total	(432)	100.2*

* Total does not equal 100 percent because of rounding.

TABLE 3

Weapon Appearances Involving A Confrontation (Continued)

USER INFORMATION

Race	#	%	Sex	#	%	Character Type	#	%
White	(364)	84.3	Male	(390)	90.3	Bad guy/criminal	(201)	46.5
Non-white	(45)	10.4	Female	(28)	6.5	Police officer	(196)	45.5
Unknown	(23)	5.3	Unknown	(14)	3.2	Good guy	(16)	3.7
Total	(432)	100.0	Total	(432)	100.0	Bad police officer	(11)	2.5
						Family or friend of target	(4)	0.9
						Unknown	(4)	0.9
						Total	(432)	100.0

TABLE 3

Weapon Appearances Involving A Confrontation (Continued)

Results	(#)	%
Compliance	(148)	34.3
Resistance	(96)	22.2
Miss-resistance	(79)	18.3
Death	(29)	6.7
Injury	(26)	6.0
Compliance & resistance	(15)	3.5
Injury, compliance	(7)	1.6
Not applicable**	(7)	1.6
Miss, no injury	(5)	1.2
Miss, resistance, compliance	(4)	0.9
Miss, compliance	(4)	0.9
Miss, injury, resistance	(4)	0.9
Miss, death, resistance***	(4)	0.9
Miss, injury	(2)	0.5
Injury, resistance	(1)	0.2
Miss, death, compliance	(1)	0.2
Total	(432)	99.9*

* Total does not equal 100 percent because of rounding.

** The result is "not applicable" when "attempted uses" are prevented by outside interference (compared to resistance by target).

*** Two of these incidents involved the death of two persons. Therefore, while all incidents in the "result" category *involving* death total only 34, the actual death count was 36.

When single and multiple whites are added together, they constitute a total of 351 of 432, or 81 percent, of all targets. Single and multiple nonwhites, on the other hand, amount to only 54, or 12 percent, of all targets. Single and multiple male targets together represent 373 of 432, or 86 percent, of all targets. As for character types, single plus multiple bad guys/criminals represent about half of all targets in confrontations, while single and multiple police officers together constitute only 31 percent of that group.

What were the results of these confrontations? Compliance by the target is the most frequent (148 of 432 incidents, or 34 percent), followed by resistance by target (96 or 22 percent). Understanding the significance of the result frequency distributions means .ecognizing the extent to which possible results are dictated by the manner in which the weapons appeared and the number of targets involved in the confrontation. For instance, "resistance" and "compliance" were possible only if the target was simply threatened with a weapon, not if it was actually "used" upon the target. In contrast, any result which includes a miss, injury, or death is associated with an actual weapon "use." Finally, as explained in the methodology supplement (appendix D), combinations of results, such as "miss-resistance-compliance" are created in confrontations with *multiple targets*.

Only 36 deaths and 41 injuries were recorded in the programs viewed. This finding, along with the predominance of resistance and compliance in the result category, reflects a much larger number of "threats" than of "uses" during confrontations. Associations between manners of appearance and results are discussed further in the following section on cross-tabulations.

Cross-Tabulations for Confrontations

WEAPONS ANALYSIS

Seventy-nine percent of all confrontations involved handguns, and handguns involved in arrest attempts accounted for 42 percent of all confrontations. Approximately half of confrontations with both single and multiple targets involved *threats* with handguns, while 25 percent involved the actual "use" of

such guns.[1] When the handgun threats occurred, the result was compliance almost twice as often as it was resistance (130, as compared to 74 out of 217 total handgun threats). However, when handguns were actually fired, resistance resulted seven times more frequently than compliance. In fact, *resistance* to handgun "uses" took place 1.4 times more often than any other result of such incidents.

A similar analysis can be made for results of the 94 confrontations involving weapons other than handguns (long guns, knives, sticks or clubs, and other hand-held weapons combined). When non-handguns were used only to threaten (N=27) compliance resulted twice as often as resistance. However, when non-handguns were "used," resistance took place 8 times more often than compliance. It is also interesting to note that non-handguns were used much more often (55 of 94 confrontations) than they were "used" to threaten (29 of 95), whereas the reverse is true for handguns.

USER ANALYSIS

Whites chose handguns almost 5 times more often than any other weapon in confrontations, while nonwhites in such situations chose handguns only 1.5 times more often than any other weapon.

Because the vast majority of both weapon users and weapon targets were white, most confrontations involved whites using their weapons against one another. Whites confronted nonwhites in only 9 percent of all confrontations. Non-whites, who accounted for only 10 percent of all weapon users in confrontations (45 of 432 incidents), had 28 white targets and 9 non-white targets.[2]

A cross-tabulation between the weapon and the user's character type shows that police officers with handguns were the most frequently seen users during confrontation situations (44 percent, or 189 of 432), while bad guys/criminals with handguns were seen 29 percent of the time. Police officers chose handguns in 96 percent of all confrontations in which they were weapon users. This is expected, since police officers carry handguns at all times. Bad guys/criminals chose handguns almost twice as often as all other weapons in confrontations.

It is interesting to note that in all confrontations in which

police officers were users, they threatened with their weapons nearly 75 percent of the time (139 of 196 incidents) and "used" those weapons only a little more than 25 percent of the time. Because police officers were the majority of handgun users, their tendency to threaten with, rather than "use," their weapons accounts for at least part of the finding that, in general, handguns were more often seen in a threat context than in any other.

To demonstrate this point in a slightly different way, criminals/bad guys were responsible for 57 percent and police for only 32 percent of all weapon "uses." Of all 246 threats with weapons, 56.5 percent involved police and 37 percent involved bad guys/criminals.

Police officers making arrests accounted for about 43% of all confrontations. When bad guys/criminals were weapon users in confrontations with single targets, their reason was premeditated murder in 39 percent, or 55 of 141, such incidents. When bad guys/criminals confronted multiple targets, however, resisting arrest was the most common reason for their weapon use (43 percent of 60 such confrontations).

Police were targets of weapon use by bad guys/criminals in 25 percent of all confrontations, and bad guys were targets of police weapon users in 40 percent of all confrontations. When police officers were users, 88 percent of their targets were bad guys/criminals. However, when the latter were users, police officers were their targets only 55 percent of the time, and other bad guys/criminals 13 percent of the time.

In general, police weapon use met with compliance and criminal weapon use with resistance. Given the typical confrontation of police apprehending suspects, the 44 to 47 percent compliance rate for single and multiple targets, respectively, is not surprising. In confrontations with single targets, bad guy/criminal weapon users most often met resistance (38 of 143, or 27 percent), which reflects an unsuccessful threat, or with "miss/resistance" (32 of 143, or 22 percent), a situation in which a weapon was "used" unsuccessfully. Resistance as a more common result for bad guys/criminals than for police is probably explained by the greater distribution of results for the former group, which reflects their tendency to "use" weapons more often than to threaten with them. (Results of the police

officers' weapon uses tended to cluster in the simple "resistance" and "compliance" categories, reflecting their greater number of threats over "uses.")

Death occurred in 4 percent of the cases involving police weapon use against a single target (6 of 135); for bad guys/criminals with single targets, death resulted 13 percent of the time (19 of 143). This is another example of the greater spread of results for bad guys/criminals. Among the 28 deaths resulting from weapon use against a single target, 68 percent involved bad guy/criminal users and 21 percent involved police officers.

TARGET ANALYSIS

In the 432 confrontations seen, 81 percent of all targets were white, 86 percent were males, and 79 percent were the targets of handguns. Most of these handgun targets were bad guys/criminals (192 of 340, or 56.6 percent), while police were targets of handguns in only about 25 percent of all confrontations. Consider, however, that when bad guys/criminals were targets during confrontations (across *all* weapons; a breakdown by weapon type is not available here), they were the targets of threats in 138 of 212 incidents, or 65 percent, and of actual "uses" only 32 percent of the time. In comparison, police officers in confrontations were targets of threats in only 57 of 132 cases, or 43 percent, and of actual "uses" proportionately more often than were bad guys/criminals (48.5 percent).[3]

Police officers, then, were the targets of actual attempts on their lives much more often than were bad guys/criminals. This reflects the fact that police weapon users (whose targets were almost exclusively bad guys/criminals) attempted to threaten with their weapons rather than "use" them. Bad guy/criminal users, however, whose targets were mostly police officers but also included a significant proportion of other bad guys, tended to do just the opposite.

Of the 432 confrontations observed, 37.5 percent involved bad guys/criminals as targets. In the 76 confrontations in which the reason for weapon use was premeditated murder, police officers were targets 51 percent of the time, good guys 21 percent, and bad guys/criminals 17 percent. However, when death was the result of a confrontation, less than 10 percent of the targets were police officers and more than half were bad

guys/criminals. (Note that although only 34 incidents *involved* death, there were actually 36 deaths, as two incidents accounted for 2 deaths each.) Thus, many of the attempts at premeditated murder upon police officers were unsuccessful. In the 41 injuries, 32.5 percent of targets were police officers and 47.5 percent were bad guys/criminals.

RESULTS ANALYSIS

Handguns were involved in more than 78 percent of the results of confrontations with both single and multiple targets.[4] In the following sections, the results of both handgun and non-handgun confrontations will be discussed considering separately the results with single and multiple targets.

Single Targets. In confrontations with single targets, when handguns were the weapon, compliance with threats was the most frequent result (37 percent, or 89 of 241 for all possible combinations). When non-handguns were the weapons in such confrontations, "miss and resistance"[5] to the weapon "use" was the most frequent result (21 percent, or 14 of 68 possible combinations). This indicates that handguns were more often instruments for threatening and non-handguns were more often actually "used." Nevertheless, death occurred in almost 20 percent of all handgun "uses" upon single targets, and injury accounted for 25 percent of the results of handgun "uses."

When non-handguns were "used" against single targets, "miss and resistance" was also the most frequent result (14 of 42 incidents, or 33⅓ percent). Interestingly, however, though the sample size is quite small, death was almost as common a result in such confrontations, occuring 31 percent of the time (13 of 42 incidents). Injury was the result in 29 percent of those confrontations.

It is difficult to compare the "lethality" of handguns and non-handguns in confrontations with single targets because of the smaller sample size of non-handguns "uses." However, it appears that, relative to their number, non-handguns "uses" more often resulted in injury or death than did handgun "uses." Table 4 summarizes these findings.

Multiple Targets. Again, handgun threats were the most frequent manner of weapon appearance (68 of 104, or 65

TABLE 4
Results of Weapon Uses Against Single Targets

	Handguns		Non-handguns	
Result	N	%	N	%
Miss and Resistance	36	47.4	14	33.3
Death	15	19.7	13	31.0
Injury	14	18.4	10	23.8
Injury-Compliance	5	6.6	2	4.8
Miss-No Injury	3	3.9	2	4.8
Miss-Compliance	3	3.9	1	2.4
Total	76	99.9*	42	100.1*

* Total does not equal 100 percent because of rounding.

percent, of all handgun confrontations), and the result was compliance 60 percent of the time (41 of 68 cases). Actual handgun "uses" accounted for only 33 of 104, or 32 percent, of all handgun confrontations with multiple targets. Miss and resistance was again the most frequent result of those uses, but much more so than with handgun uses against single targets. In the very few cases in which non-handguns were employed against multiple targets, a similarly high proportion of the results was miss and resistance. These findings are reasonable because people in a group are more likely to resist a single attacker than a single individual would be.

Injuries and deaths among multiple targets of both handguns and non-handguns accounted for a much smaller proportion of results than when single targets were involved. The relatively low rate of injuries and deaths among multiple targets is also reasonable and confirms the concept of "strength in numbers." Table 5 summarizes these findings.

Single and Multiple Targets. The most common reason for confrontations was to make an arrest.[6] Most confrontations which occurred for this reason involved threats rather than "uses." (Remember that police officers threatened much more often than they actually fired their weapons.) However, when resisting arrest was the reason for a confrontation, a weapon "use" was more common than a threat. (Recall that bad guys/

TABLE 5

Results of Weapon Uses Against Multiple Targets

	Handguns		Non-handguns	
Result	N	%	N	%
Miss and Resistance	21	63.6	8	61.5
Miss-Resistance-Compliance	4	12.1	2	15.4
Miss-Resistance-Death	4	12.1	1	7.7
Miss-Resistance-Injury	3	9.1	1	7.7
Miss-Compliance-Death	1	3.0	1	7.7
Total	33	99.9*	13	100.0

* Total does not equal 100 percent because of rounding.

criminals more often "used" than threatened with their weapons.)

Although there were only 36 deaths in this sample of prime-time television, the reasons for the weapon use which caused them merit attention (see table 6). One of the most surprising findings was the large number of shots fired that missed. Of 265 shots fired by handguns, 223, or 84 percent, were misses; only 8 percent resulted in injury, and 7.5 percent in death. Of 81 shots fired by long guns, 81 percent were misses; only 6 percent resulted in injury, and 11 percent in death. The sample sizes for "uses" of all other weapons were small, but 2 deaths were caused by knives and 5 by other weapons. No deaths resulted from the "use" of sticks, clubs, or pipes.

Police officers "using" their weapons caused 15 injuries and 9 deaths. Most of their targets—10 of the 15 injured and 7 of the 9 killed—were white males.

Fourteen police officers were injured; 10 were attacked by white assailants and 4 by non-whites. Six of the 14 assaults on police officer which resulted in injury were committed with handguns, 1 with a long gun, 3 with a stick, club, or pipe, and 4 with other weapons. The reasons for the injurious assaults on

TABLE 6

Reasons For Weapon Uses Resulting In Death

A. Confrontations with Single Targets

Reason	Number Of Deaths
Premeditated Murder	18
Robbery	1
To Make Arrest	6
To Resist Arrest	1
Self-Defense	1
To Force	1
Total	28

B. Confrontations with Multiple Targets

Reason	Number Of Deaths
To Make Arrest	3
To Resist Arrest	3
Premeditated Murder	2
Total	8

police officers included resisting arrest, premeditated assault, attempted murder, and "to force." Eleven of the 14 injured officers were white.

All 4 of the police officers killed had white assailants and 3 of the 4 officers killed were white. Three of the 4 deaths were inflicted by a long gun, and 1 by a handgun. In the 3 long gun cases, the reason was premeditated murder. In the handgun incident, the reason for the murder was to resist arrest.

C. Nonconfrontations

Table 7 shows the kinds of weapons and users involved in situations that were not confrontations—that is, when weapons were not aimed at a human target. Handguns were again the predominant weapon (58 percent, or 116 of 201), though they were a smaller majority here than in confrontations. Most non-confrontations involved "potential threats" (62 percent, or 125 of 201

TABLE 7

Weapon Appearances Not Involving Confrontations

Weapon Type	(#)	%	Manner of Appearance	(#)	%
Handgun	(116)	57.7	Potential threat	(125)	62.2
Long gun	(71)	35.3	Shown only	(64)	31.8
Knife	(10)	5.0	Shown being loaded or cleaned	(12)	6.0
Stick, club, pipe	(2)	1.0			
Other	(2)	1.0	Total	(201)	100.0
Total	(201)	100.0			

TABLE 7

Weapon Appearances Not Involving Confrontations (Continued)

USER INFORMATION

Reason	#	%	Race	#	%	Sex	#	%
To make arrest	(99)	49.3	White	(153)	76.1	Male	(160)	79.6
Not applicable	(76)	37.8	Not applicable	(29)	14.4	Not applicable	(29)	14.4
To resist arrest	(8)	4.0	Non-white	(14)	7.0	Female	(10)	5.0
Self-defense	(7)	3.5	Unknown	(5)	2.5	Unknown	(2)	1.0
To force	(6)	3.0	Total	(201)	100.0	Total	(201)	100.0
Premeditated murder	(5)	2.5						
Total	(201)	100.1*						

* Total does not equal 100 percent because of rounding.

TABLE 7

Weapon Appearances Not Involving Confrontations (Continued)

TARGET INFORMATION

Character Type	#	%	Race	#	%	Sex	#	%	Character Type	#	%
Police officer	(122)	60.7	Not applicable	(201)		Not applicable	(201)		Not applicable	(201)	
Bad guy/criminal	(37)	18.4									
Not applicable	(29)	14.4									
Good guy	(11)	5.5									
Bad police officer	(1)	0.5									
Unknown	(1)	0.5									
Total	(201)	100.0									

TABLE 7

Weapon Appearances Not Involving Confrontations (Continued)

TARGET INFORMATION

Result	#	%
Not applicable	(201)	

incidents), meaning that users held their weapons ready to confront a target with whom they had not yet come in contact. Forty-nine percent of all non-confrontations involved making an arrest (or, more accurately, preparing to make an arrest). In another 38 percent, no reason could be applied because weapons were only shown, or were being loaded or cleaned.

Once again, weapon users in non-confrontations were overwhelmingly whites and males. Police officers were the vast majority (122 of 201 users, or 61 percent) of all weapon users in non-confrontations, a finding generally explained by frequent and prolonged chase situations showing police with their weapons drawn in scene after scene, in which they are looking for but have not yet found the "bad guys."

FOOTNOTES

1. Of all confrontations with single targets, 149 of 309, or 48 percent, were handgun threats; 68 of 130, 52 percent, of all confrontations with multiple targets wre handgun threats. Approximately one-fourth of all confrontations with both single and multiple targets were handgun "uses."

2. Whites chose handguns in 300 of the 364 confrontations in which they were weapon users. Non-whites chose handguns in 27 of their 45 weapon confrontations.

3. Expressed in another way, when one considers all 246 threats, bad guys/criminals were targets 56 percent and police officers only 23 percent of the time. In looking at all 164 "uses," police officers were targets 39 percent and bad guys/criminals 41.5 percent of the time.

4. Handguns were involved in 78 percent (238 of 304) of all such results in confrontations with single targets, and in 80 percent (102 of 128) of all such results with multiple targets.

5. In this situation, a weapon is used unsuccessfully during a target's resistance. As indicated previously, "non-handguns" include long guns, knives, sticks or clubs, and other hand-held weapons.

6. "To make arrest" was the reason for 41 percent, or 125 of 304, of all confrontations with single targets, and for 48 percent, or 61 of 128, of all confrontations with multiple targets.

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSIONS

Before discussing what was seen in this television study, it is important to note what was *not* seen. Most notably, there was not nearly as much death, brutality, blood and gore as expected. Only 36 deaths resulted from the weapons that were observed, approximately 1 death for every 2 hours of viewing.[1] There were 41 injuries, but virtually no instances of blood; injuries were extremely antiseptic and victims died quickly and quietly.

These facts were surprising, expecially in light of claims made by anti-television violence pressure groups. For example, a background paper on television violence issued by the PTA, an organization figuring prominently in the campaign to end televised violence, states in the very first line: "Practically every day of the year, blood, gore, and brutality enter the American home."[2] Further, in a commentary accompanying standards on media and television violence, the *Report of the Task Force on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention* states: "It is not hard to imagine the impact that the nightly reign of terror, mayhem, and blood on television can have on children's attitudes toward interpersonal aggression."[3]

Granted, these groups may base their claims on a study of programming that includes television movies, which tend to be more graphic in depicting suffering and injuries. Still, these statements seen unwarranted in light of the violence shown on this sample of 73 hours of prime time action shows.

The relative infrequency of deaths (setting aside the matter of who died, for what reason, and who was responsible), the absence of blood and other signs of suffering may be a result of network changes over the past five years, made in response to the public's outcry. David Gerber, producer of "Police Story" and "Police Woman," both of which were viewed in this study, complained during an August 1977 round-table discussion with *TV Guide* magazine that the networks have "thrown in the towel" and "any realistic (police) shows are off."[4]

David Wolper, executive producer of "Roots," "Chico and the Man," and various documentaries, stated during the same *TV Guide* interview that "toning down violence is making violence seem not as horrible as it really is. They (the networks) are sanitizing violence. . . . And the more violence there is, and the more repulsive it is, the more these people will feel the horror of what it (is) really like."[5]

Consider, in this regard, an actual account by a gunshot victim, as reported in a recent *Washington Post* feature, "I'm Shot!":[6]

> *Suddenly there was a tremendous roar . . . . I was hit. It felt like I had been hit with a haymaker in my chest. My right arm stung and burned. But the most serious wound, the one that had all my attention in a few seconds, was the one just under my left eye.*
>
> *The pain seemed to overcome all the others. It was excruciating, just like somebody had driven a nail in my cheek. My head was spun around. . . .*
>
> *Blood was flowing out of my nose. I didn't know exactly where it was coming from. I thought it might be coming from the eye. It was shut, and I couldn't get it open. I was down on my knees in the mud and I was shouting, 'You shot me. You shot me.' I couldn't believe what had happened.*
>
> *. . . However an outsider perceives the experience—it often seems so orderly and painless on television, for example—a shooting victim nearly always undergoes such trauma that his life is never the same.*

Wolper's view is echoed by Aaron Spelling, co-president of Spelling-Goldberg Productions, which produces such shows as "Charlie's Angels," "Starsky and Hutch," "S.W.A.T.," and "The Rookies." Spelling believes that "the industry is slowing down the violence to a degree that is dangerous. I think that we are going to be faced with plastic television that's going to breed a plastic society. We're going too far."[7]

One can assume that Spelling and Wolper refer to the danger of sanitized violence as being its "unreality"—i.e., that toned-down violence produces images vastly understating the seriousness of violent situations. However, a central conclusion of

George Gerbner, the nation's top media violence expert, is that heavy television watchers significantly overestimate the extent of violence and danger in the world, "including overestimations of the number of police in America, the effectiveness of police, the percentage of violent crimes, and their own chances of being victimized."[8]

There is clearly a paradox when one compares the reasoning of Gerbner and the television producers, even though both conclude that the violence portrayed in television action shows is somehow dangerous. The producers apparently believe that television does not make violence real enough, while Gerbner seems to say that there is too much real violence on television and the way it is presented can cause dangerous misconceptions on the part of viewers. Although it is difficult to know if viewers believe what they see on television represents the real world, it is possible based upon the findings of this study, to agree with both points of view.

While there was not any significant incidence of "blood-and-guts" violence viewed in this study, an extraordinary number of weapons were recorded. In 73 hours of prime time action show television viewing, 648 weapon appeared—an average of about nine (8.87) per hour. It is our opinion[9] that both the mere presence of weapons and weapon use on television constitute violence in a very real sense. To the extent that violence is synonymous with force and domination, the presence and use of weapons as instruments of such force are also inherently violent.

Seventy-two percent, or 468 of the 648, weapons appearances involved handguns, and 67 percent involved a confrontation between the weapon user and another individual. Pointing a handgun at someone, and certainly firing such a weapon at another individual, is a substantially more violent and lethal act than giving that person a bloody nose. Whether the weapon is fired or not, the possibility of death—the extreme consequence of all violence—is much more real when television characters are shooting at each other than when they are "punching it out" in a back alley.

For some reason, critics of television violence have not emphasized weapon use as being particularly objectionable, but when violence is conducted by the use of deadly weapons

the stakes become much higher. Also, the networks seem to view the use of weapons as an effective prop to heighten the tension of a plot. It appears, then, that producers, in response to objections to television violence over the years, have replaced blood, guts, and fist fights with guns.

In considering the other side of the coin, the producer's view, a real problem arises. The consequences of using deadly weapons are portrayed far from realistically on television. In this regard, the producers quoted earlier have a valid point: violence is unrealistic. Guns and other deadly weapons are standard fare on television, but blood and guts are not. For instance, an extraordinary number of actual shots fired on television were misses. Of 265 shots fired by handguns, 84 percent were misses, and 81 percent of the 81 shots fired by long guns were misses. Television viewers rarely see gunshots cause injury, and even when they do, people don't bleed (or at least, we don't see them bleed). When people do die on television, they don't appear to suffer, so killing someone really does not seem painful. As one observer put it, "Killing is as common as taking a walk; a gun is more natural than an umbrella."[10]

When this antiseptic aspect of televised violence is combined with the frequent use of deadly weapons on television, the worst possible situation results. For example, if it is true that viewers become desensitized to the violence they see on television, they may come away with the impression that it is acceptable to have and use deadly weapons. Also, if they use their weapon, they may think they won't hurt anyone that much. If they do, they won't make a mess.

This is not to imply that television should be bloodier, but rather to point out that the *combination of images* which television produces may be particularly dangerous. Objections may thus be directed to the presence of deadly weapons in inordinate numbers on television (and they are inordinate even considering the large number of police characters), a situation exacerbated by the unrealistic lack of severity attached to the consequences of using those weapons.

In associating weapons and violence with power and force on television, it is interesting to look at another possible effect on viewers. A recent article by Michael Robinson points to the

increase in police action programming as effective in reinforcing a tendency toward "political neo-conservatism." "Police action shows," Robinson writes, "have created a public opinion in favor of broader state authority to deal with specifically criminal behavior."[11] Certainly the data in this study show that weapon use on crime dramas is very structured, with a consistent message: no matter how crafty and cunning the bad guy/criminal, the police officer is more so and, above all, he is committed to enforcing the law. And, the police officer always gets the criminal.

As previously mentioned, George Gerbner's research has concluded that a heavy diet of prime time television makes viewers overestimate the amount of crime and their chances of being victimized. Those viewers, he says, "may accept established authority too meekly and uncritically, because they want it to protect them against the 'bad' elements in society. They may condone the use of excessive force against those elements, which they see as lurking everywhere."[12]

Whether or not current prime time programming reinforces "political neo-conservatism" or an exaggerated idea of police effectiveness, as Robinson and Gerbner suggest, certainly "cop worship" is a possible result. The idea of police as indisputable heroes may or may not be harmful, but their immoderate and stangely sanitary use of weapons, coupled with possible viewer desensitization to televised violence, can present dangers. Young viewers, in particular, may not keep in mind that television's tough and cunning police heroes are among the few persons legally entitled to possess and carry deadly weapons. Moreover, the rebel-against-the-establishment characterization of some current television police heroes—most notably "Baretta"—increases the likelihood that viewers may disassociate their hero from the police establishment. How many viewers, for example, are aware of the severe legal and administrative restrictions on police use of weapons?[13] Most police shows also give no indication that police typically spend 10 percent or less of their on-duty time in crime-fighting activity. The other 90 percent is devoted to such tasks as traffic court, routine patrol and paperwork.

This is not to say, "Don't make police our television heroes." Nor is it meant to advocate more emphasis on the mundane side

of police work. One wonders, though, whether police shows would be any less entertaining if police stars were seen dealing with criminals without so much use of deadly force. It seems unfair to give viewers a totally one-sided view of problem solving by police.

The real problem may be, as articulated by researcher Marie Winn, "not that (children) learn *how* to commit violence on television . . . but that television conditions them to deal with real people as if they were on a television screen. Thus, they are able to 'turn them off,' quite simply, with a knife or a gun or a chain, with as little remorse as if they were turning off a television set."[14]

There is little evidence that television programming will change much (most of the shows viewed in this study were still on the air six months later). However, the documentation in this report may be helpful in measuring any programming changes that do occur and the extent to which they do not. Certainly, the effects upon viewers of many aspects of television violence remain unanswered. For example, do viewers believe that violent acts are as harmless as they are portrayed on television? Do they think weapon use is as casual or that its effects are as minimal as they are on television? Not only should descriptive analyses of this type be expanded, but more precise measurements and long-term research are needed both about the nature of television violence and the short and long term effects, if any, of television weapon use on its viewers.

FOOTNOTES

1. This figure does not take into accout the 12 deaths resulting from the use of non-hand-held weapons (i.e., automobiles, poisons), which were excluded from our analysis. See appendix B for a summary.

2. "TV Violence: When Is It Too Much?" (Chicago, Ill.: Parent Teacher Association), Mimeographed, 1977.

3. National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Standard 3.44, "Media-Television Violence," *Report of the Task Force on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976), p. 178.

4. "Sex and Violence: Hollywood Fighst Back," *TV Guide*, August 27, 1977, p. 6.

5. Ibid., p. 7.

6. *The Washington Post*, October 21, 1977, p. A1.

7. *TV Guide*, p. 8

8. Gerbner and Gross, "Living With Television."

9. Supported by the research of Berkowtiz, *et al.*, "The Stimulating and Inhibiting Effects of Weapons on Aggressive Behavior." (University of Wisconsin: Mimeograph, 1977.)

10. Cline, "The Child Before the TV," p. 26.

11. Michael J. Robinsion, "Television and American Politics: 1956-1976." *The Public Interest*, no. 48, Summer 1977, pp. 37, 48.

12. "The Year of the Cop," *Rolling Stone*, April 21, 1977, p. 61.

13. Reacting to criticism over the shooting deaths of twenty-nine persons this year, the Los Angeles Police Commission recently ordered police officers not to fire their weapons unless an innocent life would be saved. The new policy states, "A reverence for the value of human life shall guide officers in considering the use of deadly force." The policy forbids officers to use deadly force to protect themselves from assaults in which serious results are unlikely, and orders them to exercise such force only after exhausting all reasonable alternatives. See *Police Use of Deadly Force* (Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation, 1977) for a further discussion of the restrictions on police weapon use.

14. Marie Winn. *The Plug-In Drug: Television, Children and the Family* (New York: Viking Press, 1977), p. 74.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
Form for Recording Data on Weapon Appearance

Show _____ Day/date/time _____ Network _____ Page____

Incident No.	Weapon Type	Manner of Appearance	Reason	User (R/S/A)*	Target (R/S/A)*	Result

* (R/S/A) denotes race, sex and approximate age.

APPENDIX B

Weapon Uses Recorded, but Excluded from Analysis

All weapon uses were tracked during television show monitoring; however, because the analysis was limited to instances of appearance and use of hand-held weapons only, the incidents listed below were excluded from the sample. It is interesting to note that, almost without exception, the weapon or instrument was used "violently" and the results were very often death.

Weapon	Reason	Result
Automobile	Premeditated murder	Death
Automobile	Premeditated murder	Death
Automobile	Premeditated murder	Miss/no injury
Automobile	Unpremeditated assault	Death
Automobile	Premeditated murder	Slight injury
Automobile	Premeditated murder	Death
Automobile	Premeditated murder	Miss/no injury
Dump truck	Premeditated murder	Miss/no injury
Automobile	Premeditated murder	Death
Hands (to strangle)	Premeditated murder	Death
Hands (to strangle)	Premeditated murder	Resistance/no injury
Arm (to strangle)	Premeditated murder	Death
Hands (to strangle)	Self-defense	Compliance
Arm (karate)	To make arrest	Compliance
Explosives	Premeditated murder	No injury/death
Explosives	Premeditated murder	Death
Explosives	To force	Serious injury
Explosives	Premeditated murder	Slight injury
Explosives	Premeditated murder	Miss
Explosives	Premeditated murder	Slight injury
Explosives	Premeditated murder	Miss
Drug (administered)	To force	Compliance
Carbon Monoxide	Premeditated murder	Death
Drugs (attempted use)	Premeditated murder	N/A
Drug (administered)	To force	Compliance
Cyanide	Premeditated murder	Death
EKG Machine	To force	Compliance
Snakes	Premeditated murder	Death
Lazer (target practice)	To scare	Compliance

APPENDIX C

Criminal Types Seen on Television

While all criminal types (both users and targets) are combined into a single "bad guy/criminal" category, it was interesting to keep track of what kinds of criminals were seen. Following is a list of criminal types involved in weapon appearances either as users or as targets. Each criminal was counted only once per show, regardless of the number of times he or she was a weapon user or target, but the categories are not mutually exclusive i.e., an individual who was both a murderer and a pornographic movie producer was counted once in each category. (The criminal types are listed in order of decreasing frequency.)

Murderers	40
Robbers/burglars (street type)	17
Drug dealers (non-Mafia)	14
Miscellaneous Mafia types	12
Extortionists	9
Mafia "hit men"	7
Blackmailers	6
High class thieves (gold, jewels, art, etc.)	6
Psychotic types	6
Mafia types involved in gambling	5
Non-Mafia types involved in gambling	5
Criminals involved in fraud (e.g., real estate, business)	5
Rapists	4
Pornographic movie producers	4
Fences	4
Mafia types in protection rackets	3
Illegal arms suppliers (to foreign countries)	3
Kidnappers	2
Embezzlers	2
Loan sharks	1
Mafia types involved in drug dealing	1
Traitors to U.S. (selling government secrets)	1
Falsified documents dealers	1
	158

APPENDIX D

METHODOLOGY SUPPLEMENT

Definition of "Manner of Appearance"

Each time a weapon appeared, the "manner of appearance" and data from other variables[1] were recorded. Eight distinct manners of appearance were defined as follows:

1. *SHOWN ONLY*—Applies when the camera is simply focused on a weapon that is either being handled briefly by a user without a target, or shown without any connection to a user.
2. *SHOWN BEING LOADED OR CLEANED*
3. *POTENTIAL THREAT*—Applies when there is no confrontation between user and target, but user is holding weapon in preparation for such a confrontation.
4. *THREAT*—Applies to a confrontation involving threatened use of force by weapon user upon weapon target.
5. *ATTEMPTED USE*—Applies to a user who clearly attempts, for example, to fire a gun or stab with a knife, but is prevented from actually doing so by the target's resistance or escape, or by intervention from a third party.
6. *USE*—Applies to a weapon user who actually discharges a firearm, or stabs with a knife.
7. *USE ON NON-HUMAN TARGET*—Applies to both the use of firearms in target practice and situations in which a firearm or a blunt instrument, for example, is used upon an object (rather than a person) or to threaten or frighten someone.
8. *GUN USED TO HIT*—Applies to a gun used only in this context and not fired.

The circumstances surrounding a weapon apperance were recorded and described from the moment the weapon appeared in a given scene. If there was a change in how the weapon appeared (for example, from "shown only" to "use"), this information was recorded as two separate incidents of weapon appearance. If the camera moved away from the weapon and its user for a significant length of time (as in a switch to another scene or to a commercial break), then returned to the same weapon being used in the same way by the same person, the weapon appearance were recorded separately. However, if the same weapon was used in the same way by the same person within the same scene, but against a number of different targets, the appearance, weapon, and user were counted only once, along with information describing the multiple targets.

Defintions of "Reason" Categories

The primary reason for each weapon appearance was recorded. Usually the motivation of the weapon user was clear to the viewer, making it easy to ascribe a reason to the weapon appearance.

Following is a complete listing and explanation of each of the reasons for weapon appearance and a typical case in which each would apply:

1. *PREMEDITATED MURDER*—Applies to weapon users intending to kill someone and who planned the attack in advance, whether or not the attempt is successful. An example is a murder of a man who "knew too much" about a Mafia venture and was about to inform the police.

2. *RAPE*—Applies to users who employ a weapon in committing a rape. An example is holding the victim at knifepoint to prevent resistance or escape.

3. *PREMEDITATED ASSAULT*—Applies to weapon users intending to injure but not kill someone, and who planned the assault in advance. An example is beating up a pimp with a club to "teach him a lesson" about the dangers of infringing upon Mafia territory.

4. *UNPREMEDITATED ASSAULT*—Applies to weapon users who attack the target in the heat of passion or under circumstances not planned in advance. An example is a

man arguing violently with his wife over whether or not she has cheated on him. In her rage, the wife picked up a nearby butcher knife and stabbed her husband.

5. *ROBBERY*—Applies to users who employ a weapon to commit a robbery. An example is holding bank customers and employees at gunpoint while collecting bags of money, or hitting a victim over the head with a lead pipe in order to steal his wallet.

6. *TO MAKE ARREST*—Applies to police officers who threaten or otherwise use their weapons for the purpose of arresting a subject.

7. *TO RESIST ARREST*—Applies to users who employ or threaten with a weapon for the immediate purpose of avoiding or resisting arrest. An example is police officers arriving at the home of a suspect in order to make an arrest, and the latter opens fire on the officers from a window.

8. *SELF-DEFENSE*—Applies to weapon users who use or brandish weapons to defend themselves from anticipated or actual attacks by others. An example is police officers defending themselves from attacks outside an arrest situation, or a women taking a handgun from her bedside table to defend herself against an intruder she hears downstairs.

9. *TO FORCE*—Applies to weapon users who force another person to do something against his/her will (excluding rape, robbery, or other reasons described before). An example is holding a hostage at gunpoint to prevent escape.

10. *TO FRIGHTEN*—Applies to (usually threats rather than actual weapon uses) weapon users intending to frighten, rather than to force someone to do something. An example is a man who demonstrates his prowess with a gun by firing at a series of small objects in order to discourage another man from "messing with" him.

11. *RANDOM/PSYCHOTIC*—Applies to weapon users, usually portrayed as mentally deranged, who have no clear rational reason for their actions. An example is a man who fires his rifle into a crowded street, not aiming at anyone or anything in particular.

12. *NOT APPLICABLE*—Applies to cases in which the manner of apperance is self-explanatory, for example as "shown only" or "shown being loaded or cleaned." If the weapon was used against an object, as in target practice, the reason given is "not applicable." If, on the other hand, a weapon was fired at an explosive (another "non-human" target) in order to murder someone standing near that explosive, another reason would apply.

While a user in some cases had more than one reason for brandishing or "using" a weapon, only the immediate, central reason was recorded. For example, if a robber was surprised by police in the middle of a robbery and picked up a nearby baseball bat to fend off the advancing officer, the reason for his weapon use would be recorded as "to resist arrest." Only when a weapon was clearly being used as an instrument in a crime (as in holding bank personnel at bay with a shotgun) would the reason be listed as "robbery" or another crime.

While one might think that "unpremeditated assault" would apply to the baseball bat example, the term was applied instead to heat-of-passion situations such as domestic quarrels. However, any time an individual used or threatened the use of a weapon against police officers whose purpose was arrest, the reason given was "to resist arrest"—not self-defense, unpremeditated assault, or a particular crime.

Other distinctions which merit clarification are those among premeditated assault, unpremeditated assault, and premeditated murder. The first term applies to instances in which the weapon user clearly intends to injure, not kill, a target. While this distinction may seem obscure, the dialogue leading up to an incident usually made the weapon user's intentions obvious. For example, a couple of bad guys/criminals in "The Rockford Files" went to the hero's trailer to "rough him up" because they wanted information. Their reason was clearly premeditated assault rather than premeditated murder.

In contrast, when a Mafia hit man fired a few rounds from his machine gun at Baretta, having just been told by his boss that Baretta was "getting too close" and would have to be "gotten rid of", his reason was clearly premediated murder, even though his shots missed Baretta.

The difference between premediated assault and unpremeditated assault was largely determined by the dialogue and action preceding the weapon appearance. The judgments made in distinguishing between these two reasons were not legal, but rather based upon our perceptions as viewers. If, for example, an individual clearly planned an assault in advance, took the time to prepare or obtain a weapon, and then followed the target in order to attack, the reason was premeditated assault if he clearly intended only to injure the person. It was premeditated murder if he clearly intended to kill. If, on the other hand, two individuals were quarrelling and one grabbed a letter opener and stabbed the other, the reason was labeled unpremeditated assault.

Explanation of Character Type Categories—Weapon Users

1. *POLICE OFFICER*—Applies to police officers, but also to private detectives, security guards, certain military personnel, and other persons who, as a privilege of their profession, are legally entitled to carry a weapon. However, police users were primarily sworn police officers in this study.
2. *"BAD" POLICE OFFICER*—Applies to police officers engaging in criminal activity, such as extortion or murder. This category does not include police officers of the "anti-hero" genre who were seen using questionably legal means to apprehend suspects.
3. *NON-POLICE GOOD GUY*—Applies to individuals whose roles are clearly those of "good guys" but who are not police officers or other persons legally entitled to carry weapons. An example is "Quincy," a medical examiner.
4. *BAD GUY/CRIMINAL*—Applies to individuals whose intentions or actual deeds are obviously criminal or clearly dishonorable. Known "bad guys/criminals" who were portrayed sympathetically—perhaps as trying to "set things right" or prevent further wrong—were still classified under "bad guy/criminal."
5. *FRIEND OR FAMILY MEMBER OF TARGET*—Applies to those who supersede the "good guy" and "bad guy/criminal"

categories. Regardless of whether an individual was portrayed as good or bad, if he or she used a weapon against a close friend or relative, this category was used.

6. *UNKNOWN*—Applies to unidentified weapon users (e.g., disguised), or when not enough information was given, *up until the time of the weapon appearance*, for the viewer to be sure of the user's character. This was true even when identity or character was revealed later in the program.

7. *NOT APPLICABLE*—Applies to weapon apperances in which there is no user. This category is limited to "shown only" appeaances.

Explanation of Character Type Categories—Weapon Targets

All of the character types described for weapon users also apply to targets. In addition, the following single target category was created:

INNOCENT BYSTANDER—Applies to characters with no primary involvement in the story. An example is a passerby in the street, a shop customer, or a bank employee.

The following additional categories apply to weapon appearances involving more than one target:

MULTIPLE POLICE OFFICERS—Applies to all or some police officer targets, or others included in the police officer category.

MULTIPLE GOOD GUYS—Applies to all or some non-police officer targets, but clearly "good" character types. An example is a group of targets composed of police officers and other "good guys," or a mix of police officers and innocent bystanders, would be classified as "multiple good guys."

MULTIPLE BAD GUYS AND CRIMINALS—Applies to all bad guys/criminals targets as defined in the user categories.

MULTIPLE GOOD AND BAD GUYS—Applies to a group of police officers or other good guys and criminals targets. This target mix might arise if a police officer is working undercover and is arrested along with criminals.

MULTIPLE FAMILY OR FRIENDS OF USER—Applies to

those who supersede the "good guy" and "bad guy" categories. An example is a group of targets associated with the weapon user as family or friends.

MULTIPLE INNOCENT BYSTANDERS—Applies to incidental characters, as described previously.

Explanation of "Results" Categories

1. *RESISTANCE*—Applies to a target attempting to prevent, flee from, or otherwise resist user's action, through means such as flight, hand-to-hand struggle, or reciprocated weapon use.
2. *COMPLIANCE*—Applies to a target yielding to user. An example is a target who did not "put up a fight," or performed an activity demanded by a user threatening with a weapon.
3. *MISS/NO INJURY*—Applies to a weapon and a target which did not make contact. An example is an instance where the weapon was a firearm, the target was not hit by a bullet.[2]
4. *INJURY*—Applies to a target slightly or seriously injured on-screen as a result of weapon use. Also applied to targets who appeared to be injured to the point of death, but it was unknown or unclear throughout the shown whether death occurred.
5. *DEATH*—Applies to a target who died on-screen as a result of the weapon use.
6. *NOT APPLICABLE*—Applies to non-target or non-confrontation incidents where the weapon is coded, for example, as "shown being loaded or cleaned," "shown only," or "potential threat."

Combinations of the above result categories were created to account for the fact that a single weapon appearance could effect more than one result (e.g., "injury" and "compliance"). In addition, when there were multiple targets, multiple results often occurred. The following categories reflect these combined results.[3]

- Compliance and resistance;
- Miss and resistance;
- Miss, resistance and compliance;
- Miss and compliance;
- Miss and injury;
- Miss, injury, and resistance;
- Injury and resistance;
- Injury and compliance;
- Miss, resistance, and death; and
- Miss, compliance, and death.

64

FOOTNOTES

1. "Variable" refers to the general *category* of information recorded (e.g., weapon type, race of weapon user).

2. Where multiple shots were fired, resulting in injury or death, only the injury and death were recorded for data analysis, even though some of the bullets might have missed. Separate calculation was made of the number of misses compared to the number of hits for all shots fired. Those results are presented in the "Results Analysis" of the cross-tabulation section.

3. Note that in the analysis section of this report, certain combined result categories were simplifed by singling out common denominators for attention.

APPENDIX E

Weapon Appearances, Injuries and Deaths, by Program Episode

Program	Episode 1			Episode 2			Episode 3			Episode 4		
	Weapon Appearances	Injuries	Deaths	Weapon Appearances	Injuries	Deaths	Weapon Appearances	Injuries	Deaths	Weapon Appearances	Injuries	Deaths
Sunday Night Mystery Movie												
McMillan	9	0	0	1	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lannigan's Rabbi	3	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
McCloud	36	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hawaii Five-O	19	0	0	8	1	2	11	0	0	43	2	3
Police Woman	16	2	1	7	1	0	7	1	0	18	1	1
Kojak	6	1	1	12	2	1	2	0	0	16	0	3
Police Story	27	1	2	13	0	0	7	2	1	8	0	0
Baretta	12	2	1	2	0	0	11	1	0	25	1	0
Charlie's Angels	5	1	0	5	0	0	6	0	0	13	1	1
Delvecchio	23	2	0	8	0	0	5	0	0	—	—	—
$6 Million Man	5	0	0	3	0	0	9	1	0	9	2	0
Feather & Father Gang	3	0	0	6	0	1	5	0	0	1	0	1
Starsky & Hutch	17	0	0	11	0	2	16	0	1	16	1	1
Kingston: Confidential	1	0	0	10	0	0	3	1	0	4	2	0
Barnaby Jones	7	1	1	9	0	1	8	0	2	11	2	2
Switch	3	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	2	1	0
Rockford Files	10	1	0	11	2	0	14	1	1	3	0	0
Quincy	5	0	0	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0

APPENDIX E

Weapon Appearances, Injuries and Deaths, by Program Episode (Continued)

Program	Episode 1			Episode 2			Episode 3			Episode 4		
	Weapon Appearances	Injuries	Deaths	Weapon Appearances	Injuries	Deaths	Weapon Appearances	Injuries	Deaths	Weapon Appearances	Injuries	Deaths
Miscellaneous:												
Bionic Woman	6	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Most Wanted	7	1	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dog and Cat	16	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hunter	13	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Andros Targets	0	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Stonestreet	12	1	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Additional publications available from the United States Conference of Mayors Handgun Control Staff include:

- HANDGUN CONTROL: ISSUES AND ALTERNATIVES $3.00
- ORGANIZING FOR HANDGUN CONTROL: A CITIZEN'S MANUAL $3.00
- DO MANDATORY PRISON SENTENCES FOR HANDGUN OFFENDERS CURB VIOLENT CRIME? (Technical Report No. 1) $2.00
- HOW WELL DOES THE HANDGUN PROTECT YOU AND YOUR FAMILY? (Technical Report No. 2) $2.00
- PEOPLE VS. HANDGUNS: THE CAMPAIGN TO BAN HANDGUNS IN MASSACHUSETTS (Technical Report No. 4) $2.00
- PROCEEDINGS: FIRST NATIONAL FORUM ON HANDGUN CONTROL (Los Angeles, May 1975) $3.00
- PROCEEDINGS: SECOND NATIONAL FORUM ON HANDGUN CONTROL (Boston, January 1976) $3.00
- POSTERS (Set of 5) $2.00

To obtain copies of these publications, make check or money order payable to the U. S. Conference of Mayors and mail to:

U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS
1620 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006